



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,052

10/10/2006

Daniel Christopher Brookings

CELL-0305

3974

20306

7590

07/07/2008

MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP
300 S. WACKER DRIVE
32ND FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

RAHMANI, NILOOFAR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/07/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/561,052	Applicant(s) BROOKINGS ET AL.	
	Examiner NILOOFAR RAHMANI	Art Unit 1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 October 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/03/2007 and 03/06/2008 and 06/13/2008</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-10, 12-25 are currently pending in the instant application. Claim 11 is cancelled.

2. ***Priority***

This application was filed on 10/10/2006, which is a 371 of PCT/GB04/02621, filed on 06/18/2004, which claims the priority of UNITED KINGDOM 0314492.0, filed on 06/20/2003 and UNITED KINGDOM 0329485.7, filed on 12/19/2003.

3. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-10, 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 1-10, 12-25 lacks description of the claims i.e. "hydrate". Hydrate is unpredictable because there are different hydrates. There are $\frac{1}{2}$ hydrate, 3 hydrates, or $\frac{3}{4}$ hydrate, etc. Therefore, the specification lacks description of "hydrate".

4. ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-10, 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates and hydrates of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. a) Determining if any particular substrate would form a solvate or hydrate would require synthesis of the substrate and subjecting it to recrystallization with a variety of solvents, temperatures, pressures, and humidity. The experimentation is potentially open-ended. b) The direction concerning the solvates is found on pages 61-62, which simply states Applicants intent to make them. c) There is no working example of any hydrate or solvate formed. The claims are drawn to

solvates, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ... no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, applicants must show that solvates can be made, or limit the claims accordingly.

d) The nature of the invention is chemical synthesis, which involves chemical reactions. e) The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). West, Anthony R., "Solid State Chemistry and its Applications, Wiley, New York, 1988, pages 358 & 365. The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is their compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot

predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the solvate. f) The artisan using Applicants invention to prepare the claimed compounds would be a process chemist or pilot plant operator with a BS degree in chemistry and several years of experience. g) Chemical reactions are well-known to be unpredictable, *In re Marzocchi*, 169 USPQ 367, *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18. h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the thousands of compounds of formula *** as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate".

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

5.***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for inhibition p38 α , does not reasonably provide enablement for treating HIV, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinson's disease, and etc. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1) the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art, 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor, 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

- 1) The breadth of the claims.
- 2) The nature of the invention,
- 3) The state of the prior art,
- 4) The level of one of ordinary skill,

- 5) The level of predictability in the art,
- 6) The amount of direction provided by the inventor,
- 7) The existence of working examples,
- 8) The quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure.

The nature of the invention: The instant invention is drawn to method for treatment of a disorder for which an inhibitor of p38 MAP kinase is indicated, which comprises administering to a patient in need of such treatment a compound of claim 1.

The state of the prior art: "Substance P (SP), a member of the tachykinin peptide family, is a major mediator of neuroimmunomodulatory activities and neurogenic inflammation within the central and peripheral nervous system. SP has been shown to induce the expression of proinflammatory cytokines such as IL-6, which might be implicated in the etiopathol. of several human brain disorders. The authors showed in a previous study that nanomolar concns. of SP triggered activation of NF-.kappa.B, a transcription factor involved in the control of cytokine expression. However, activation of NF-.kappa.B was not involved in SP-induced expression of IL-6. Here, the authors describe p38 mitogen-activated protein kinase (p38 MAPK) as a signal transduction component that operates independently from NF-.kappa.B activation and that mediates SP-induced IL-6 expression in the human astrocytoma cell line U373 MG. SP induced the phosphorylation of p38 MAPK within 10 min, and this activation persisted up to 30 min and was independent from p42/44 MAPKs and protein kinase C activation, which all are induced after stimulation with SP. As

shown by EMSA, p38 MAPK was not involved in SP-induced activation of NF- κ B. P38 MAPK, however, mediated SP-induced IL-6 expression as shown by the use of specific inhibitors of this kinase. Our results suggest that activation of p38 MAPK is an important component controlling neurogenic inflammation within the CNS independently from NF- κ B. Drugs targeting this MAPK may therefore interfere with SP-correlated neuropsychiatric disorders and may represent a therapeutic approach in these disorders.”(Fiebich et al., Journal of Immunology (2000), 165(10), pages 5606-5611).

The predictability in the art: It is noted that the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F. 2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. In the instant case, the instantly claimed invention is highly unpredictable since one skilled in the art would recognize that in regards to the therapeutic effects, whether or not the compounds of formula of claim 1 would be useful for treating a pharmacological condition in a subject.

Amount of guidance/working examples: Applicant provides no guidance for using a therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) could treat any and all known or unknown diseases. Nor does applicant identify what diseases are treatable by therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I).

The breadth of the claims: The breadth of claims is drawn to method for treatment of a disorder for which an inhibitor of p38 MAP kinase is indicated, which comprises administering to a patient in need of such treatment a compound of claim 1.

The quantity of undue experimentation needed: Since the guidance and teaching provided by the specification is insufficient for treating diseases associated with therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) is efficacious, one of ordinary skill in the art, even with high level of skill, is unable to use the instant compounds as claimed without undue experimentation.

The level of the skill in the art: The level of skill in the art is high. However, due to the unpredictability in the pharmaceutical art, it is noted that each embodiment of the invention is required to be individually assessed for physiological activity by in vitro and in vivo screening to determine which compounds exhibit the desired pharmacological activity and which diseases would benefit from this activity.

Taking all of the above into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claims 12-25, for treating diseases associated with therapeutically effective amount of a compound of Formula (I) is efficacious, have been enabled by the instant specification.

6. Claims 12-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being possibly enabling for treating specific diseases,

does not reasonably provide enablement for preventing diseases. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. Applicants are not enabled for preventing any of these diseases. The only established prophylactics are vaccines not the compounds such as present here. In addition, it is presumed that "prevention" of the claimed diseases would require a method of identifying those individuals who will develop the claimed diseases before they exhibit symptoms. There is no evidence of record that would guide the skilled clinician to identify those who have the potential of becoming afflicted.

"The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. 1) As discussed above, preventing diseases requires identifying those patients who will acquire the disease before occurs. This would require extensive and potentially opened ended clinical research on healthy subjects. 2) The passage spanning line 11, page 25 to line 21, page 30 lists the diseases Applicant intend to treat. 3) There is no working example of such a preventive procedure in man or animal in the specification. 4) The claims

rejected are drawn to medical treatment and are therefore physiological in nature. 5) The state of the art is that no general procedure is art-recognized for determining which patients generally will become afflicted before the fact. 6) The artisan using Applicants invention would be a Board Certified physician who specialized to treat diseases with an MD degree and several years of experience. Despite intensive efforts, pharmaceutical science has been unable to find a way of getting a compound to be effective for the prevention of disorder diseases generally. Under such circumstances, it is proper for the PTO to require evidence that such an unprecedented feat has actually been accomplished, *In re Ferens*, 163 USPQ 609. No such evidence has been presented in this case. The failure of skilled scientists to achieve a goal is substantial evidence that achieving such a goal is beyond the skill of practitioners in that art, *Genentech vs. Novo Nordisk*, 42 USPQ2d 1001, 1006. This establishes that it is not reasonable to any agent to be able to prevent disorder diseases generally. That is, the skill is so low that no compound effective generally against disorders has ever been found let alone one that can prevent such conditions. 7) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). 8) The claims broadly read on all patients, not just those undergoing therapy for the claimed diseases and on the multitude of compounds embraced by Formula (I).

The Examiner suggests deletion of the word "prevention".

7. *Claim Rejections - Obvious Double Patenting*

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 168 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130 (b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-10, 12-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims 1-31 of US 2006/0004025. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current invention embraces the invention claimed in the above patent.

Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP §2141.01)

Christopher et al. of US 2006/0004025 claimed identical compounds in claims 1-31 as the instant claims 1-10, 12-25.

Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP §2141.02)

The difference between the instant claims and the issued claims is the claims are not word for word identical but the scope of both sets of claims overlaps mostly significantly with each other.

Finding of prima facie obviousness-rational and motivation (MPEP §2142.2143)

The issued claims 1-31 are therefore fully embraced by the instant claims 1-10, 12-25.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Niloofar Rahmani whose telephone number is 571-272-4329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/NILOOFAR RAHMANI/

07/02/2008

/Rita J. Desai/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625